

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Of pending claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-22, and 24-28, claims 1, 16, and 21 are independent. By this amendment, claims 1, 8, 10, 15, 16, 20, 21, and 25 are amended.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-17, 19-22 and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hanna et al. (WO-0172012, hereinafter "Hanna") and further in view of Bird et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,148,479, hereinafter "Bird"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Exemplary embodiments of the disclosure are directed to a method for remotely controlling and/or regulating at least one system 1. In an exemplary method, a validation code is generated that has a limited period of validity. The validation code is valid only once for a communication to be dispatched. Validity information is added to the validation code to define a limited validity period for the validation code.

Information relating to the system 1, and the validation code (including the validity information) are combined. A communication device 2 assigned to the system 1 dispatches a communication that includes the information relating to the system, the validation code, and the validity information.

In an exemplary method, after the communication has been dispatched, a message is received and processed by the communication device 2. In the

processing, a check code is extracted from the message. The validation code and the check code are used to check whether the message originates from a receiver of the communication. It is also verified whether the message is received within the limited period of validity defined by the validity information. If the checking and the verifying are successful, instruction information is extracted from the message, and the system 1 can implement the instruction information.

Independent claims 1, 16, and 21 broadly encompass features of the above-described embodiment.

For example, independent claim 1 recites a method including adding validity information to a validation code, which validity information defines the limited period of validity of the validation code. The claim 1 method includes dispatching the communication by a communication device assigned to the system, where the communication comprises the information relating to the system, the validation code, and the validation information. Claim 1 recites processing a message which the communication device receives after the communication has been dispatched, where the processing includes (i) extracting a check code from the message according to a first extraction rule (ii) checking whether the message originates from a receiver of the communication based on the validation code and the check code, and (iii) verifying whether the message is received within the limited period of validity defined by the validity information.

The Examiner acknowledges that Hanna does not disclose an authentication value which is valid for a limited period. Contrary to the Examiner's assertions, Bird does not remedy the deficiencies of Hanna.

Bird discloses an authentication scheme that involves sending challenges that have nonces, or preferably random numbers. Based on the challenge, a corresponding response is sent. Bird does not disclose that a challenge includes validity information that defines a limited period of validity of the nonce. Further, Bird does not verify whether the response to the challenge is received within a limited period of validity defined by validity information.

Accordingly, Bird does not disclose verifying whether a message is received within a limited period of validity defined by validity information, as recited in each of claims 1, 16, and 21.

Hanna and Bird, whether considered alone or in the combination alleged by the Examiner, do not disclose all of the features of claims 1, 16, and 21. Accordingly, claims 1, 16, and 21, and each claim depending therefrom, are allowable.

Conclusion

From the foregoing, further and favorable action in the form of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this amendment, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned so that prosecution of present application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: May 3, 2010

By:

fr

Patrick C. Keane

Registration No. 32858

Michael Keane #6398

Customer No. 21839
703 836 6620